

(SRI S. SIVAPPA)

know how the authorities kept quiet. A M.L.A. was forcibly removed from his House. There was no law and order. Only on the 13th morning the Assistant Commissioner promulgated the prohibitory order.

(Some members stood up to speak).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order, order. There should be no discussion on this. I have allowed Mr. Sivappa since he is the leader of the Opposition.

Sri R. M. PATIL.—On the point which my Hon'ble friend Sri Sivappa made, I wish to state that it is a serious matter. I shall have to take into due consideration in this respect of affairs that are reported in this fashion. Sir, I can only assure the House that necessary action will be taken.

Sri M. NAGAPPA (Raichur).—Questions can be allowed on behalf of the persons who have called the attention of the Hon'ble Ministers. Those members have got right to put questions. I have submitted this fact before long and the Hon'ble Speaker was also kind enough to give a ruling on this. I am prepared to quote or give a ruling of the Lok Sabha in this behalf. According to this ruling a member concerned is allowed to put question. This House also may allow that procedure laid down in the Lok Sabha. I request the Chair to consider this point.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—We are not following the procedure of the Lok Sabha here. But anyway I will consider.

NOTICE OF ADJOURNMENT—REPRESENTATIONS FOR CONSENT OF THE SPEAKER

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Mr. Bangarappa, Mr. Azeez Sait and Mr. M. S. Krishnan have also given a notice on the same matter. Yesterday also they raised the issue. But it was postponed for to-day. Anyway, the matter could be discussed when the demands for grants relating to Police Department are taken up.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, this is a very important matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—There is no need to spend time on this. Anyway, I will ask the Hon'ble Minister for Home to state what has happened there.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, it is a specific matter. It is entirely different.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The matter is already before the House. Anyway, I will ask the Hon'ble Minister to say what has happened there. Of course, it is a matter which has happened in the course of maintaining law and order.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, even according to rule 54, if the Hon'ble Speaker is not going to give any consent, the proviso to the said rule states that the notice of motion be read by the Hon'ble Speaker and to give reasons for refusing the consent. I do not want that we should deviate the procedure. Let us go according to the procedure itself. Therefore, I submit Sir, that if such a matter is discussed in the course of the discussion on demands for grants, we will not have opportunity to give our districtwise difficulties in these matters. This is an important incident which has occurred in Channapatna taluk. I will now read the motion. Whatever ruling you want, you can give afterwards.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Consent is withheld. The member will please read sub-clause (vi) of Rule 53.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—I will read it. The sub-clause (vi) of Rule 53 states:

“the motion shall not anticipate a matter, which has been previously appointed for consideration. In determining whether a discussion is out of order on the ground of anticipation, regard shall be had by the Speaker to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the Assembly within a reasonable time.”

But that is not the important factor here. It is entirely different one, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—This is not a different matter. I have already stated that this has happened in the course of maintaining law and order.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Even then Sir, according to rule 54, I will read out. It states:

“The Speaker, if he gives consent under rule 50 and holds that the matter proposed to be discussed is in order, shall, after the questions and before the list of business is entered upon, call the member concerned who shall rise in his place and ask for leave to move the adjournment of the Assembly.”

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—That arises only after consent is given.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, I may be permitted to explain the reasons which compel me to move this motion and press for its consideration.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—This is not necessary. The rule says: “if necessary” and not otherwise. I have already stated that the consent is withheld. It is disallowed. Anyway, I will ask the Hon'ble Minister to say...

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, according to the proviso to rule 54 (1), the Hon'ble Speaker has to give the reasons for rejection of notice.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have already given the reasons.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—What Mr. Nagappa wants is that you have to read the motion. You may give any reason. After you read the motion, as you said, the Home Minister may make a statement. The only thing is that you have to read the motion and give your ruling.

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.—Sir, under rule 52 (ii) I wish to draw your attention. But here there are two to three matters not only regarding the incident that took place in Ramanagaram but also one which concerns the basic policy that has been adopted by the Government in the maintenance of Law and order. Under these circumstances, since several matters are involved in it, I do not think it correct, you can draw our attention to sub-rule (ii) of rule 52. And in proviso to rule 54 no doubt you are well within your limits to read it or not to read it. But here are 4 or 5 members in the Assembly who have drawn your attention to a very important matter which is vitally important, which has been happening in our State from so many months, *i.e.*, firing by police. Secondly, no one can think also to get proper protections in regard to this. From the point of minorities it may be either Muslim or any other minority community, this may be taken up since the Police and particularly the Government has failed in this respect. They have forgotten their duties. That is why I want you to give your consent, on this.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—This is the notice of adjournment motion given by Mr. Nagappa :

“I learnt that the police on 10th March 1968 at Ramanagaram had resorted to firing without any proper reasons, and the circumstances also never warranted such an action. There is a very grave situation in the Ramanagaram Town, because of the improper administration of the police. I therefore wish to move the following motion :

‘This Assembly stands adjourned to discuss an important issue of not maintaining the law and order in Ramanagaram village by the Government and created an unwarranted situation by resorting to firing.’”

Now, the Hon'ble Minister for Home may give his views on this.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—Before the Hon'ble Member says anything why should you say anything? As this is a very important question it should be taken seriously and not so light-heartedly.

Sri S. S. SHETTAR (Hubli).—When an adjournment motion has been moved by an Hon'ble Member and it has already been considered, the question of another motion will never arise and when the Hon'ble Minister is called upon to make a statement, I do not know whether the Chair is interested in it. Let us finish the first motion and later on second motion may be considered.

3-00 P.M.

ಶ್ರೀ ಅಜೀಜ್ ಸೇಟ್.—ನಮಗೆ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಶ್ರೀ ನಾಗಪ್ಪನವರು ಕಳಿಸಿರುವ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಬೇರೆ, ಶ್ರೀ ಕೃಷ್ಣನ್ ಕಳಿಸಿರುವುದು ಬೇರೆ, ಶ್ರೀ ಬಂಗಾರಪ್ಪನವರು ಕಳಿಸಿರುವುದು ಬೇರೆ. ಈಗ ತಾವು ಶ್ರೀ ನಾಗಪ್ಪನವರದನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಓದಿದಿರಿ. ಎಲ್ಲರದ್ದನ್ನೂ ಓದಬೇಕು.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Under the rules, only one adjournment motion can be considered.

ಶ್ರೀ ಅಜೀಜ್ ಸೇಟ್.—ತಮಗೆ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಓದಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಾನು ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಓದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಓದಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಅಜೀಜ್ ಸೇಟ್.—ಶ್ರೀ ನಾಗಪ್ಪನವರದ್ದು ಮಾತ್ರ ಓದಿ ಬೇರೆಯವರದ್ದನ್ನು ಡಿಸ್-ಆಲೋ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

Sri V. N. PATIL (Humnabad).—You have to give reasons.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—My submission is this is a matter pertaining to the honour and rights and property of minorities. The Chair cannot deal with this question so easily and so light-heartedly.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Chair has disallowed it.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—Under the rules you have to give reasons.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have stated several times that consent is withheld.

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.—I am not questioning your disallowing the adjournment motion. I have every respect for your rulings. But you have to give reasons for it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have stated the reasons also.

Sri DIGAMBARA RAO B. KALMANKAR (Aland).—I want to support the adjournment motion of Mr. Nagappa. The person who has moved the motion should be allowed to say something in respect of that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I allowed Mr. Nagappa and he has said something.

Sri DIGAMBARA RAO B. KALMANKAR.—On the matter he has not said anything.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Only if consent is given, he will be given a chance. Otherwise he will not be allowed to say anything.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಬಂಗಾರಪ್ಪ.—ಒಂದು ಕ್ರಿಯಾರೋಪ, ಸ್ವಾಮಿ; ನನ್ನ ಕ್ರಿಯಾರೋಪ ವೇನೆಂದರೆ, ನಾವು ಮೂರು ನಾಲ್ಕು ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ಕಳಿಸಿದಂಥ ನಿಲುವಳಿ ನೋಟೀಸ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ತಳ್ಳಿಹಾಕಲಾಯಿತೆಂದು ಹೇಳೋಣವಾಯಿತು. ನಾವು ಮೂರು ನಾಲ್ಕು ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ಮೋಷನ್ ಮೂವ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಟಾಗ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಶೆಟ್ಟರ್ ಅವರು ಒಬ್ಬರು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮೋಷನ್ ಮೂವ್ ಮಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವವರೆಗೆ ಮತ್ತೊಬ್ಬರು ಮೂವ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅದು ಸರಿಯೆಂಬ ಭಾವನೆ ನಮಗೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ತಾವು ಈಗ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನಾಗಪ್ಪನವರ ಮೋಷನ್ ಮಾತ್ರ ಓದಿ ಉಳಿದವರ ಮೋಷನ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ತಳ್ಳಿಹಾಕಲಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ. ರೂಲ್ಸ್ 52 ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ (1)(2) ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೋಷನ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ತಳ್ಳಿಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದೇ ವಿಷಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮೂರು ನಾಲ್ಕು ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ನಿಲುವಳಿ ನೋಟೀಸ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳಿಸಿದ್ದರೂ ಸಹ ಅವರು ಕೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳು ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ರೀತಿ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈ ದಿನ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನಾಗಪ್ಪನವರದ್ದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ನಾಳೆ ಮತ್ತು ನಾಡಿದ್ದು ಬೇರೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ನಾನು ಕಳಿಸಿರುವ ಮೋಷನ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—They all pertain to one matter.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—I raise a point of order. My point of order is Rule 52(i) says :

“Not more than one such motion shall be made at the same sitting.”

It is an accident or incident that a number of adjournment motions were moved together. Now, according to me, the Speaker shall have no right to club all the adjournment motions together and decide because Hon'ble Member Mr. Nagappa who moved the adjournment motion has only referred to the police firing and he has not referred to the death ; in the other motion moved by Mr. Bangarappa and myself, we have referred to the death of a person resulting from police firing and one seriously injured admitted to the Victoria Hospital. Even Mr. M. S. Krishnan has also referred to the death and injured. Therefore my contention is that the adjournment motion moved by me and Mr. Bangarappa is separate from the one moved by Mr. Nagappa. My point of order is that my adjournment may be taken up tomorrow and it need not be clubbed with Mr. Nagappa's adjournment motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—If any point of order relates to my ruling, it is not a point of order. I have already given the ruling. There is no question of taking it up again.

Sri R. M. PATIL (Minister for Home and Municipal Administration).—It is reported that on 10th March 1968, at about 3-30 P.M., there was a minor incident in Ramanagaram town which led to a breach of peace. It appears that two boys aged about 20-25 years were assaulted by some persons for alleged misbehaviour. On hearing this, large crowds of people armed with sticks and stones collected. The Sub-Inspector of Police rushed to the spot immediately, with the available policemen and tried to control the mob. The Assistant Superintendent of Police, Channapatna, reached the spot at about 4-15 P.M. with additional police strength. As the situation was fast deteriorating, prohibitory orders under section 144 Cr P.C. were promulgated by the Tahasildar Magistrate, Ramanagaram. However, this had no effect on the surging crowd. As the crowd attempted to set fire to houses and did not disperse in spite of repeated appeals by loudspeakers and lathi-charge, two warning rounds were fired in the air. The crowd began to disperse thereafter.

By this time, the trouble spread to other areas in the town. The crowd started pelting stones indiscriminately. At about 8 P.M. some of the rioters set fire to an old van parked on the road-side, and two thatched shops. They also looted a teashop on the road-side. As the warning and lathi charge had no effect, the police fired two rounds of warning shots in the air to disperse the crowd. The trouble continued. At about 8.45, people from Nalabandwadi gathered in large numbers and rushed towards the police pickets and tried to overpower and snatch

their rifles. The crowd started pelting stones at the police picket party, as a result of which six policemen were injured. The police warned the people to disperse. This having failed, they had to fire two rounds in self-defence at the violent mob. As a result of this firing, one person died and another person was injured. On account of pelting of stones by the mob, 12 persons sustained injuries. Adequate police arrangements have been made and the situation is now reported to be well under control.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Harihara).—I want one clarification from the Hon'ble Minister, Sir. Whether in a situation like this, what are called warning shots and shots in the air are permissible under the rules,—no tear gas, no lathi charges. As far as my knowledge goes, it may be old—there is no such thing as firing in the air only for purpose of scaring away. This is a very dangerous thing that has occurred in the police administration. That is my knowledge—probably it may be outmoded. The first thing is lathi charge, then tear gas and then straightaway shooting if it is absolutely essential.

Sri R. M. PATIL.—When the mob is militant, firing in the air is no use. It has its own bad effects. In such cases, straight firing is always advisable. But in a case where the mob is trying to hide and seek air shot is something which is effective. But in this case, these incidents have taken place in more than 2 to 3 places. Therefore, wherever there was shooting in the air, people scared away. That is why they did it. But when the mob at the last moment collected, it was stated to be militant mob irrespective of the use of fire arms. The people collected at 8.45 P.M. and when the police were likely to be overpowered, and their arms were about to be snatched, in such a case, there was no other alternative except shooting straight. In this case it has been done.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—It has not occurred only once. These matters are coming up almost once a week. It is a recurring affair. Government would do well to examine this question thoroughly and lay down clear orders where firing can be indulged in and what is the procedure that will have to be followed. Because some times, it happens, firing in the air will not be ineffective, but will also be an incitement to further trouble.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—Sir, yesterday immediately on hearing the news, I, Sri Rajasekharappa, M. P. and some others visited the troubled spots. The information of the Hon'ble Minister is based on the information which he gets from his subordinates in the Police Department. Beyond that, he knows nothing. He is acting on the information with him. I would appeal to the Hon'ble Minister: he may himself go and inspect the spot. After all Ramanagaram is not far away. It is only 28 miles from here. I have still confidence in the Hon'ble Minister for Home. I know he is a man of integrity. He should go and see the situation on the spot. By what we say and by the enquiries we made, there is no doubt that the police firing was completely unwanted and unwarranted.

(SRI AZEEZ SAIT)

It is learnt that there were only five persons standing of which one was a municipal councillor and three or four others. The name of the Municipal Councillor is AKBAR KHAN. The police came there in a jeep and started using abusive language. The Municipal Councillor said there is no trouble here and trouble has subsided and there is no justification for firing. The police started abusing them and immediately they shot once in the air and the next shot was aimed at the person resulting in one death and serious injury to another. This has been brought home to the I. G. P. and other officials by Mr. Rajasekharappa. Now what I want to say is that the police also were rather partisan in their attitude. The supposed attempt to set fire to the Thasildar's office to which the Hon'ble Minister referred, is at a distance. The Hon'ble Minister can see this for himself if he pays a visit to the spot. What I want to be done at least in the future is things should be done in a proper manner. People are being victimised and lathi charge and shooting should not be the order of the day. This is not the first time. Already 6 or 7 communal clashes have occurred. I want to know whether it is a sin or shame to be a Muslim? If I am a Muslim, am I not an Indian? Why should I not be protected like others? In Ramanagaram there has always been communal unity, unity between Hindus and Muslims. If the Government in power could not deal with a few unsocial elements whether they be Muslims or Hindus, I do not think there will be any Government at all worth the name. Government owes a duty to protect the honour, life and property of the minorities. Otherwise, I think there will be no safety.

So, I want the Hon'ble Minister to visit the spot and make a correct statement. The statement given by his subordinate officers does not seem to be correct. I want him to go and verify the statement, and find out whether what we say is correct or whether what his subordinates have said is correct. If what his subordinate officers have said is not correct, he should punish them, for giving wrong information.

SRI M. S. KRISHNAN.—I am not elaborating. I only want to add one thing more.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—There is no need to elaborate that any more.

SRI M. S. KRISHNAN.—I have only one request to make to the Minister.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order, order.

SRI S. S. SHETTAR.—It is a very dangerous to hear a certain thing only partly. We must hear it fully. Let the Minister make the whole thing very clear and tell us why communal riots have taken place, what

was the incident in Ramanagaram because it was the most unfortunate incident. * * * *

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order, order. The Reporters need not take down anything.

(As directed by the Deputy Speaker the rest of Sri S. S. Shettar's speech was not taken down.)

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.—I have only one request to make to the Minister.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I request the member kindly to resume his seat. We have been spending time unnecessarily on this.

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.—I want to request the Minister to take steps to see that communal harmony is established. * * * *

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order, order. The Reporters need not take down anything.

(As directed, what Sri M. S. Krishnan said further was not recorded.)

BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR 1968-69—DEMANDS FOR GRANTS

[Demand Nos. 2, 7, 8, 33, 38, 42, and 51]

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಡಿ. ದೇವೇಗೌಡ (ಹೊಳೆನರಸೀಪುರ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಚ್ಛಿತಕ್ಕೂ ಡಿಮಾಂಡುಗಳು ಎಂದರೆ 2, 7, 8, 33, 38, 42 ಮತ್ತು 51 ಈ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗಳ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಯತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಡಿಮಾಂಡುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅಳವಡಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಮುಂದಿನ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಕಾರದಲ್ಲರತಕ್ಕ ಫೋರಣ್ ಹಾಗೂ ಲೋಪದೋಷಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಚಿವರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಲು ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

[MRS. CHAIRMAN (SMT. NAGARATHNAMMA HIREMATH) in the Chair]

ಇದೇ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಂದೆ ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಎಂ. ಎ. ಕೃಷ್ಣಪ್ಪನವರು ಈ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲರತಕ್ಕ ಕ್ಷಾಮದ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರವೇಶಗಳು ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಿವೆ ಅವುಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಶಾಶ್ವತವಾಗಿ ಸರಿಹಾರ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ನೂತನ ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಫ್ಯಾಮಿನ್ ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಟುಟರಿ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಒಂದನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಒಡ್ಡಿಸಿ ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಇಂತಹ ಸರಿಹಾರ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ಒಂದು ಭರವಸೆಯನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರು. ಪ್ರಾಯಶಃ ನಮ್ಮ ಈಗಿನ ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಇದರ ಕಡೆ ಗಮನ ಏಕೆ ಹರಿದಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವೊತ್ತು ಕ್ಷಾಮ ಸರಿಹಾರ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ತೇಪೆ ಹಾಕತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ನೈಜವಾದ ಸರಿಹಾರಗಳು ದೊರೆಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೇನೋ ಹಣ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇವೆಲ್ಲಾ ತಾತ್ಕಾಲಿಕವಾದ ಸರಿಹಾರ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳು. ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಶಾಶ್ವತವಾದ ಸರಿಹಾರ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಿಗೂ ಅನ್ವಯ ವಾಗುವಂತೆ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ನ್ನು ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಲು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನೊಂದು, ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಸುಮಾರು ನಲವತ್ತು ಕೋಟಿ ಯಷ್ಟು ಕ್ಷಾಮ ಸರಿಹಾರದ ಕೆಲಸಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಫೋಗ್ರಾಂ ತಯಾರು ಮಾಡಿ ಅದರಿಂದ

*** Matter not recorded as indicated by the Chair.